

**REMARKS**


In the Action, claims 17-18 and 20-26 were rejected either under 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103 on the basis of various prior art references. In addition, claims 1-16 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of certain claims in a co-pending application of the Applicant.

By this Amendment, in order to secure an earlier allowance of a patent from this application, claims 17-26 have all been withdrawn from the case, and a Terminal Disclaimer has been submitted in order to overcome the double patenting rejection of claims 1-16. This should not be taken to mean, however, that the Applicant agrees or acquiesces in the prior art rejections of claims 17-18 and 20-26. In fact, the Applicant traverses those rejections and is concurrently filing a continuation application in order to secure their allowance.

Thus, it is submitted that all of the claims remaining in the case, namely claims 1-16, are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ



John A. Artz

Registration No. 25,824

28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250

Southfield, Michigan 48034

Phone: (248) 223-9500

Fax: (248) 223-9522

Dated: October 2, 2003